ry between them should be the ultima thule-the utmost imit of our territory. Yes, sir, we plighted our faith and honor in that treaty, confirmed as it was by more than two-thirds of the American Senate, that beyond that limit we would never go. Yet the Senator from Illinois says that the day is coming when we shall be compelled to violate the treaty-that treaties cannot fetter our limbs or restrict our limits. Sir, I regretted to hear it, because of the influence of that Senator in his party, as one of their standing candidates for the Presidency. I should have regretted to have heard it from any Senator. We form the body that is to ratify all the treaties of the United States. We are the constitutional advisers of the President. We are a part of the treaty-making power. If it gives the Senator any regret that I stated that, I will explain to him what I did state, and thereby, I imagine, relieve him from all his regret. What I said was, that the steady, regular growth and expansion of this country would in all probability go shead in the future as it has done in the past; that you might make as many treaties as you please, and still they would not check our growth, and because they could not, it was useless to make treaties which must of necessity be violated; hence I argued against the making of treaties

in cases where we could not fulfil them.

Mr. CLAYTON. An argument in favor of fidelity and observance of treaty stipulations, indeed! The idea is, that we are incapable, from the nature of our institutions or our character as a people, of maintaining and observing treaties.
Mr. Douglas. No, sir.

pledging our faith not to do that which inevitably would

be done in the future. It was an argument in favor of

the fidelity and observance of treaty stipulations, and

that we should not, therefore, be so profuse in our pledges

Mr. CLAYTON, (laughing.) We must grow, says the Senator. Our "manifest destiny," he means, is to extend our limits.

Mr. Douglas. The idea is, that some men are incapable of comprehending the growth of this nation. A few t was supposed that we could never extend beyond the Alleghanies. There were those who thought

'Mr. CLAYTON. I have heard all that before. Mr. Douglas. Then the Mississippi, then the Pacific was the boundary. I said that the same laws which have

carried us forward must inevitably carry us further in the process of time, and that that growth will go on ; and consequently it is unwise to make a treaty-stipulation pledging ourselves not to do that which our interest may require us to do.

Mr. CLAYTON. I have given the Senator so many on portunities for explaining himself to me, as he terms it, that now I must be permitted to explain him to himself. It was but the other day he told me we must annul the Central American treaty; such was his declaration, too, on the 14th February last, in my absence. There is no escape for him from that position. There is no provision escape for him from that position. There is no provision in this treaty for notice to annul it, as he knows, and yet he reiterated his demand for its immediate annulment. One of his wise reasons for annulling it was, that the British had not observed it. With the same wisdom, a man who held a bond, whilst his debtor refused to pay would burn it or not enforce it. Driven from this position, he endeavors to shift it to what we have just heard that it is unwise, because the treaty must be annulled. Has he made his position any better? What is it that he still adheres to? He insists upon it that by some irresistible influence we are driven on in our course to such a degree of greatness that we shall be compelled to violate the treaties which we may make with foreign nations in regard to boundaries. We ought, he said, to nullify the treaty of 1850 at once. He now says that some men cannot comprehend the growth of this giant Republic. I do not know that there is any man of ordinary intelligence who does not comprehend it. There is no difficulty in understanding it. We have grown to such an extent already that we have a country greater than Rome possessed in her palmiest days. We cover a contiguous territory greater, perhaps, than ever was enjoyed by any civilized nation on earth. And yet we are told that we are no capable of binding ourselves even by treaty stipulations to observe our plighted faith, and fulfil our solemn engagement of honor. I remonstrate against the declaraon of such a principle, or rather of such a want of all principle. It is nothing more nor less than this: let there be as many explanations on the part of the Senator from Illinois as he may choose to make-that we are incapable of controlling our impulses and passions when our interests may lead us to violate our engagements. "Treaties fetter us," says he. Sir, the plighted faith of every man of honor binds him at all times, no matter what his interest may be, and the plighted faith of nations equally binds them; and the last place from which a contrary principle should be promulgated is the Senate of the United States. Here, I repeat, we sit as the constitutional advisers of the President of the United States; and if foreign nations come to understand that the position is taken by members holding a prominent party position here, that treaties cannot be any restraint upon us, what foreign nation will ever make another treaty with us? If there be a country on earth that owes more than any other to treaties, it is ours. We owe our national existence to the old French treaties of 1778. Sir, within the limits of that great State which you in part represent on this floor, (Mr. Coopen in the chair,) Washington, in the darkes period of the Revolution, at Valley Forge, wintered with his suffering soldiers, when the intelligence reached them that France had entered into an alliance with us, and had guarantied our independence. The glorious news ran through all the ranks of the American army, and the great "Father of his Country" stood up and waved his hat, and shouted for joy, in concert with his troops! Our destiny from that moment became fixed. Every American saw that we were free, whatever doubt he might have entertained about it before. We owe. I repeat, our national independence to treaties. And now, when we are becoming strong, shall we forget it? Shall not an American statesman adhere to treaties with as much fidelity as an Englishman, or a Frenchman, or one of any other nation? Shall he not rejoice that his country does stand by her houor? I trust that no idea of our growing importance, or of the necessity of our enlargement, will ever sink into the heart of any other American Senator, to induce him to abandon that principle without which our country

ably. The Senator from Illinois boasts that he opposed the treaty with Mexico. I recollect it very well, and I recollect the reason he gave for voting against it. It was the very reason which he assigned in the debate here for annul the treaty of 1850. He opposed that clause in the Mexican treaty which fixed the limits beyoud which we could not go, and he cannot explain away his position, or shift it any longer. He then said the time would come when Mexico would become indispensable to our progress and our happiness. I would recall to the recollection of gentlemen who were present on the 9th day of February, 1847, the speech made by Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina, on this very subject. In thrilling tones he gave utterance to views which seemed to carry conviction to the hearts of nine-tenths of those who heard him, and told us that Mexico was to us FORBIDDEN FRUIT. Whenever the day shall come that, in defiance of treaty limits or otherwise, we set about the business of annexing nine or ten millions of Mexicans to the United States, the days of our Republic will be numbered. The Mexican people are educated in the belief that no greater curse can befall a nation than that of slavery, and are said to be bound by treaty to abolish it. Could we permit them to take a part in the election of our Representatives and Senators in Congress? Could we admit them to assist in governing us? Sir, without any reference to that dangerous question to which I have barely alluded, there are any other questions which they would have a powerful influence and an interest in deciding against us. I am opposed utterly to annexing them; and I do not hesitate to express that opposition now and at all times. The true policy of this Government is to build up Mexico as a Republic, to sustain and cheer her by kind offices, and to each her, by our example, the science of seif-government, we could annex other countries as England does, or as Rome did when she was triumphing over the world, the whole subject might receive another consideration. When ever we annex we make citizens of the people whom we unite to us. We do not enslave them. Other countries may make slaves of those whom they subdue, and never rmit them to take any part in the government of their conquerors. If we annex Mexico we are compelled, in bedience to the principles of our own Declaration of Independence, to receive her people as citizens. Yes! Aztecs, Creoles, Half-breeds, Quadroons, Samboes, and I know not what else-"ringed, streaked, and speckled"all will come in, and, instead of our governing them, they by their votes, will govern us. Why do we want them o their territory? Are we cramped? Are we crowded Have we more population than is necessary to fill the land which we already own? There is not a more sparsely populated country on earth which is inhabited by civi lized men. We have hundreds of millions of acres of land upon which the foot of a white man never trod. When the lapse of time, all this shall be covered, then, if we find men of our own race and class, capable of sustaining our institutions and of self-government, in any contigu ous territory which can be acquired without the violation of any principle of justice or humanity, I am not one that would stay the honorable progress of my country.

would become a byword and a hissing among the nations

If we must gain more territory, let us gain it honor-

The day, however, will never come when an American Senator will be justified in the declaration that we intend to disobey treaties. No, sir; we have been, and mean to remain, faithful to treaties. We have often been accused of having violated them; but the honor of our country is yet dear to us; and it is worth more to the true American than all the land that Mexico and Central America

The Senator objects to the treaty of 1850, because, under its provisions, we cannot annex the Central American States. Were there no such treaty, he could not

countries, the line established by that treaty as the bounda- | annex them till be had first overrun Mexico, and broken | floor, either in regard to the Hise treaty or the Clayton the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Nay, he must first and Bulwer treaty. I appeal to the Senate if I mentioned annex the West India Islands, and British Honduras, too. the name of any Senator, or stated how any one man had After "swallowing Mexico," he must take in all the other intermediate countries; and as Great Britain owns many of the islands and dependencies to be devoured, he must include the British lion—a matter not quite so easy of digestion. What an intimation is it for us to make to the that a vindication of my own course involves an assault world, that we may some day annex these weak little sister Republics, thousands of miles away from us, with a population so different from ours, especially in laws, institutions, and usages! I would much rather other nations should know the fact that San Salvador, one of these very Central American States, once applied for admission into our Union, and that our Government not only declined to receive them, but treated the application as one

not worthy of a moment's serious regard.

I heard with pleasure and admiration that passage in the inaugural address of the President which declared that his administration should leave no blot upon his country's record, and that no act within his constitutional control would be tolerated which could not challenge a ready justification before the tribunal of the civilized world. How great the difference between that and the sentiments of sustain him, so far as I know, in suppressing the Hise these principles, and he will thereby disarm opposition: he will make of those who have heretofore been strong political opponents some of the warmest friends he has I put this declaration in contrast with all these gigantic ideas [laughter] of breaking treaties, and our hopes and belief, be induced to disregard the faith of treaties, he will hardly progress through half the period of his constitutional term before he will find the great heart of the American people, which is honest to the core, opposed to him, and the most sincere of his present riends will vindicate the justice of the sentence against him, while they sorrow for his fall.

Mr. MASON. I wish to make an explanation in answer to a remark of the Senator from Delaware. As a part of the evidence on which the Committee on Foreign Relations had based the opinion that the British settlements at Honduras Bay lay within the Republic of Guatemala, adduced the official map of the State of Guatemala. The honorable Senator examined it, and I understood him to say that I had committed a "mistake" when I informed the Senate, and when the committee informed the Senate, that it was shown by that map that the British settle ments at Belize were in Guatemala.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, the Senator is correct.
Mr. Masos. I understood the honorable Senator to say that the map of the State of Guatemala which I exhibited did not show that the settlements at Belize were within the limits of Guatemala. I understood him to say, in language far from being acceptable, that I had mitted a "mistake" when I informed the Senate that the map did not show it.

Mr. CLANTON. I wish to say again what I said before. The Senator sent me the map. I thanked him for it. I said I thought that the dotted lines upon the map indicated the boundaries of the State of Guatemala, and that if that were the case, then the dotted lines round the place called Belize showed that the committee of the Senate had made a great mistake. Now, I do not know (as I then said) whether the Senator had observed those doted lines, but I think they do clearly indicate that there is a separate territory, to which perhaps the attention of the Senator had not been directed, intended to be indicated by those dotted lines-that is, the Belize. I know very well he may put a different construction upon the map, but that is the construction which I put on it; and think if he will examine it himself carefully, he will see that there was some purpose, some motive in the mapmaker for making those dotted lines around the country called Belize or British Honduras.

Mr. Mason. Mr. President, it is no light matter to say that a Senator, when, in the course of his official duty, he endeavors to give information to the Senate, has comnitted a mistake; and I understood the Senator to say, and say distinctly, that in presenting this map, which I alleged did show that the settlements at Belize were in the Republic of Guatemala, I had committed a mistake. Now, sir, Senators have no right to commit mistakes. A Senaor may commit a fault. It may be venial. There may be circumstances that will excuse it or justify it, or that will account for it or explain it; but a mistake in the ourse of official duty is no light matter, and, I submit to the Senator, should not be lightly charged. I understand the honorable Senator to say now that the dotted lines and that region of country indicated the British possessions. He supposed it had escaped my attention, and therefore I had committed a mistake. He stated to the Senate that the map showed that the possessions did lie in the Republic of Guatemala. Sir, I had examined the nap with great care. It had been before me for two months. It is mentioned in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is relied upon for what it is worth by the report of the committee to show where the possessions are; and I can inform the Senator that those tted lines did not escape my attention. If he will look

siste to it is, lies within the limits of Guatemala, the dotted lines must do no more than indicate what the territory is that lay there. Sir, they are as distinct upon this map as they could be exhibited on so small a surface. The limits of these settlements prescribed in the treaty of 786 are these:

"The English line beginning from the sea shall take the centre of the river Sibun or Jabon, and continue up the raight line the intermediate land until it intersects the river

If the Senator will look at these dotted lines he will

"And by the centre of the same river the line shall descend to the point where it will meet the line already settled and marked out by the commissaries of the two Crowns in 1783, which limits, following the continuation of said line, shall be observed as formally stipulated by the definitive treaty."

The Senator will find that on this map of Guatemala, representing what Guatemala claims as its territory, the British possessions are within the territory of Guatemala, and that the dotted lines are only to indicate those provided by the treaty of 1786 as the lines of the British settlements. I understood the Senator to say yesterday that the map did not show what the committee and what claimed did show, because of the dotted lines. Now, if the Senator understands me, I mean to say this: The map shows that the settlements are in the limits of the State of Guatemala; and the dotted lines indicate nothing more than the positions of the settlements in the State of Guatemala.

Mr. CLAYTON. I have no doubt the Senator understands the matter as he explains it; but I am perfectly willing to submit the question to any set of intelligent men whom ter, and he has taken his. Let others examine it, and they will see whether the Belize settlements are included in the State of Guatemala. Mr. Douglas. I have something to say in reply to

the remarks of the Senator from Delaware. It is not my purpose to introduce any new points in the discussion.

Mr. Shields. If my colleague will give way, I will move an adjournment. He can go on to-morrow.

Mr. Douglas. I am willing to give way for that, and go on in the morning with what I have to say. On motion, the Senate adjourned.

SPEECH OF MR. DOUGLAS. OF ILLINOIS.

On the Central American Treaty concluded with Great Britain on the 19th of April, 1850, in further reply

IN THE SENATE, MARCH 16, 1853.

Mr. DOUGLAS said: Mr. President, I had a right to xpect that the Senator from Delaware, in his reply, would ave ventured upon an argument against the positions which I had assumed in my former speech, and which he had assailed. It will be observed, upon a close examination, that he has evaded nearly every point in controversy between us, under the cover of free indulgence in coarse onalities. I do not complain of this. He had a right to choose his own course of discussion. Perhaps it was prudent in him to pursue the course which he adopted. I shall not follow his example, however. I may not have the same inducements that may have prompted him. I had been driven from nearly every position I had as-sumed in debate—if nearly every material fact I had asserted had been negatived and disproved by official documents bearing my own signatures-if I had been convicted of giving one explanation of my conduct at one time, and at other times different and contradictory reasons, I might be prompted to seek refuge under personalities from the exposure that might be made. Sir, I pass

The Senator, as a last resort, attempted to get up un kind feelings between my political friends and myself in regard to this debate. He endeavored to show that my speech was an assault upon every Senator who took a different course. He went further, and charged that I, as a Presidential candidate, was pursuing this course in order to destroy and break down rivals in my own party. Sir, these insidious and disreputable assaults do not disturb my equanimity. The object is to enlist, from prejudice and unworthy motives, a sympathy in the course of discussion which he has attempted to maintain. But I appeal to the Senate if I assailed any Senator upon this

voted. I did not disclose even how the vote soud. citizen in America would have known the vote of any Senator on this floor from my speech, or from my partipelled me to pursue the course that I did.

I do not choose to occupy the time of the Sinate in a matter that partakes so much of a personal character. But the Senator cannot avail himself of that argume vindication of his course in suppressing the Hise treaty. He is not supported by that array of names which he has produced for that act. No one of the Senators ever did the Senator from Illinois! Let the President adhere to treaty. That treaty was never submitted to the Senate these principles, and he will thereby disarm opposition: for ratification. The Senate were never permitted to examine it. The treaty, to this day, has been withheld from the Senate. You will have to go elsewhere than to the files of this body to find that treaty. How can it be said that Senators have sustained him in his rejection of the beyond the limits of the country in defiance of But if the President should, in opposition to all portunity of showing whether they were for or against it? Sir, he cannot have the benefit of those names which he has quoted to shelter him upon that point.

Again, sir, he has quoted all the eminent names from Gen. Jackson down to the present time to support him in his refusal to accept of the exclusive control of the canal for his own country. Sir, he has no authority thus to quote them; he has no authority for saying that any one f those eminent statesmen were opposed to such a privilege as the Hise treaty showed that we could have acisthmus of Panama, and thus it had gone into the hands of foreigners, the administration of President Polk were content to assert our claim to an equal right. But it is not true that either of them ever refused to accept an exclusive privilege for this country when voluntarily ten-

dered to them.

I am not going to occupy the attention of the Senate with an array of names for or against this proposition. I quoted no names in my first argument. I addressed myelf to the merits of the question, and chose to decide it by arguments upon its merits, and not by the authority f great names. I would rather see the Senator sustain position now by arguments upon themerits of his own official action, and not by an appeal to the action of great men who lived at a different period, and whose acts were lenendant upon entirely different circumstances.

One word more, and I proceed to the main point at sue. The Senator has accused me of laving attempted to make this a party question. How dd I attempt it? In my speech of February last, to which he replied, he cannot find the term Whig or Democrat, or a political al-lusion, or a partisan argument. I explained my own principle of action, as evinced in my vites; and I ex-pressly stated that they were not sanctioned by either Whig or Democratic Administrations upon some of the points. I did not invoke the aid or the sympathy of party. was willing to stand upon the truth and the soundness of my own record, and leave the future to determine whether I was right or wrong on the question. Sir, partisan politics have been introduced by the Senator, and not by me. The Senator, in his speech it reply to me, endeavored to show that Democratic Administrations have done this, and Democratic Administrations have done that, and appealed to partisan authority to sustain him-self. I admit his right to introduce party questions, and to appeal to party names as authority. it, and I deny his right to charge it upon me. Sir, I invoked the aid of no partisan feeling or party organization for the support of the position I maintained. But when the Senator showed that a majority of my own party, on the ratification of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty, had reincluding a majority of my own political friends; and nothing but a sense of duty to my own character would have compelled me to take the responsibility of such a

Now; let us go back to the real point. Why all these attempts to avoid the main issue? In the first place, the Senator denied that he was responsible for not sending the Hise treaty to the Senate, inasmuch as it had been rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that dotted lines did not escape my attention. If he will look at them with the deliberation and care that the committee did, he will find those dotted lines indicate exactly the treaty limits of the settlements as prescribed in 1786.

Mr. Clayton. That is what I supposed.

Mr. Mason. Very well: then if the map shows, as it does not content with denying the does show, that that territory, no matter what the British title to the limits of Guatemala, the decided by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejected by Central America. Then, when I showed that the rejection of that treaty was procured by ha own agreed by his own have the rejection of that treaty was procured by ha own agreed by his own has the rejection of that treaty was procured by has own has the rejection of that treaty was procured by his own has the rejection of that treaty was procured by has own has the rejection of that treaty was procured by his own has the rejection of that treaty was procured by has own has the rejection of the treaty as personnel. Then, when I showed that the rejection of the treaty has one her and his Secretary of State, as produced the instructions. Then, when I showed that the rejection of the treaty as procured by descent and the rejection of the treaty as prolaming. The series that the rejection of the treaty selection of the prolamination of the treaty selection of the treaty selection of the rejection of the rejection of the rejection of the r nipon the ground that it showed that he could not have objected to it on that ground, for the reason that at that very time he proposed a guarantee, in connexion with it. I will read a passage upon this point: Great Britain, of the independence of Nicaragua, he abandons that position, and is driven to the extremity of seeking refuge under what he chooses to consider obnoxious details. When I showed that his objections to the details could not avail him, because it was no reason for withholding the treaty, according to the usages of the Senate, he then comes to the point that it was better to have a partnership privilege than an exclusive one. That brings s to the real question. Why could we not have come to find that they commence at the source of the river Sibun, and cross to the river Belize or Wallys—

it at once? If he was right in his preference for a European partnership over an exclusive privilege to his own country, why did he not avow the fact at once and justify onfessed, and which have been proven by his own written testimony, in opposition to his own denial? In his last speech the Senator chose to persevere in re-

resenting me as the advocate of a canal to be made ugh Central America, with funds from the Treasury of the United States. I need not remind the Senator that e had no authority, from any thing I have said, to attribute to me such a purpose. - I certainly did not assume any such position, while my remarks were calculated to negative such an idea. My position was this: that while negotiating for the right of way for a canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we should have accepted the offer to our own Government of the exclusive right to control it, instead of a partnership with England and the other Powers of the earth. The Hise treaty granted the privilege either to the United States or to an American company under our protection, at our option. I insisted that we had the same right to take it to ourselves that we had to he will select to look at the map, and I am willing to abide by their decision upon the very question which he has chosen to submit. I have taken my view of the mattain and regulate an exclusive privilege to America than tain and regulate an exclusive privilege to America than it did to execute and maintain a partnership privilege with European Powers. Hence his objections upon that score must fall to the ground. The simple question was, whether it would have been wise to accept that privilege. Sir, I think it would have been. I am not going to repeat the argument I made the other day upon that point. If it had been given to us, we could have opened the canal to the world upon such terms as we deemed proper. We could have withdrawn the use of it whenever a nation failed to respect our rights. It would have been a bond of peace instead of being an apple of discord between us and other nations; because, when you bring all the great Powers of the earth into partnership, constant disputes arise as to the nature and extent of the rights of the respective parties. The history of these negotiations proves

But, sir, let me ask the Senator what he has gained by his rejection of the Hise treaty? He has given the world to understand by his speeches that he has accomplished two great objects; the one to open a canal between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans; the other to put a stop to British encroachments in Central America. Has he ac omplished either of those objects? I ask what privilege he has gained to make a canal? He has not even secured the right of way for a canal, either jointly or separately. He is responsible for having defeated the project of a canal between the two oceans. He refused the grant of the right of way because it gave the right to control the work exclusively to his own country. The treaty which he caused to be made failed to receive the sanction of the nate. Thus we are left without any right of waywithout any charter, right, or privilege. complishing that object, he is responsible for its defeat. All that he has to boast of is that he deprived his own country of an inestimable privilege, the necessity and imortance of which is now conceded on all hands,

What, then, have we gained by his diplomacy? Why, sir, after having failed in getting the privilege of making the canal, either jointly or separately, he makes a treaty with Great Britain by which, if we hereafter secure it, the privilege is given to Great Britain as well as to ourselves. The Clayton and Bulwer treaty provides that any right of way or communication which may be secured at my future time shall be open alike to England and the United States, and under the joint control and protection of the two Powers. We have a treaty with England about a canal in Central America, but we have none with any of the Central American States. Let me ask, then, how much have we gained? Has he expelled the British from Central America by his treaty? What inch of country have they given up? What right have they abandoned What inch of country What functionary have they withdrawn? Where is the evidence that you have driven the British from Central

not driven the British protectorate from the ceast. We find that, instead of leaving Central America, the British have not only established a colony at the Bay Islands, but, if the newspaper information received by the last steamers can be credited, they have bombarded the towns upon the main land, and taken forcible possession of a part of the State of Honduras. Then I repeat the question to the State of Honduras. Then I repeat the question to the Scantor, what have be gained? I can tall him what has if the newspaper information received by the last steam-Senator, what has be gained? I can tell him what has find no sympathy in the youthful, uprising aspirations of resulted from his negotiation. He has recognised the the there is a difference, a wide difference, between fere with the affairs of the American States. He has re-cognised that right by a treaty; and he has guarantied to he has guarantied to and that which would be applicable to Europe. Europe England that we will use our good offices to enable them to enter into arrangements with these Central American He has excluded the idea that the question of the Central American States is an American question, and by his negotiation has opened it as a European question. In words, he has, by his treaty, abolished what is known as the Monroe doctrine with reference to a large portion of the American continent.

This brings me to the examination of another question. The Senator from Delaware chose to arraign me upon that portion of my speech in which I stated that I was unwilling to give a pledge never to annex any more territory to the United States. He then went on to argue against annexation, said we were pledged, and that the pledge given was correct, and attempted to vindicate it. He arraigned me for having said that such a treaty could not be forced through all time to come. I explained to him that my idea was that the growth of this country was so great and so rapid that the barriers of any treaty would be irwired. It is true that when Central America granted a privilege to a company in the Netherlands tomake this and so rapid that the barriers of any treaty would be resistibly broken through by natural causes, over which that the distance of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with asserting our ight to an tate of facts, were content with a section of the facts of the made it worse, and that he would show that the doctrine If it would not be deemed an indelicate interposition be involved moral turpitude; that he was amazed and grieved that any one here from this high place should proclaim

Sir, I will proceed to show my authority on that point, which I think he will be compelled to respect. In taking that position, I only reiterated the doctrine proclaimed by the late Secretary of State, and now Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. EVERETT.) in his letter to the Compte de Sartiges, a few months ago, in respect to the island of Cuba: and when the Senator from Delaware arraigns me because he will not dare to accuse him of political prefor uttering sentiments involving a want of respect for judices and partisan feeling. He has said severer things treaty stipulations or moral turpitude, I will turn him of the Senator's diplomacy than I thought the rules of over to the Senator from Massachusetts and to ex-President Fillmore, and allow them to settle that issue between President of the United States has sanctioned them, and themselves. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the letter of Mr. Evenerr to the Compte de Sartiges. In not within the rules of courtesy and diplomacy, they that letter you find the following passage in regard to a proposed convention stipulating that we would never add that the nation has sanctioned them too; for I am annex Cuba:

"The convention would be of no value unless it were lasting; accordingly its terms express a perpetuity of purpose and obligation. Now, it may well be doubted whether THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WOULD ALLOW THE ON THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT FOR ALL COMING TIME, AND PREVENT IT, UNDER ANY PUTURE CHANGE OF CIRCUMSTANCES, FROM DOING WHAT BAS BEEN SO OFTEN DONE IN TIMES PAST. In 1803 the United States purchased Louisiana and France, and in 1819 they purchased Florida of Spain. It is not with in the competence of the treaty-making power in 1852. I have referred, condemning and repudiating the diplo-EFFECTUALLY TO BIND THE GOVERNMENT IN ALL ITS BRANCHES | macy of the Senator from Delaware in relation to the AND FOR ALL COMING TIME NOT TO MAKE A SIMILAR PURCHASE | American continent. OF CUBA."

"There is another strong objection to the propo IS AN AVERSION TO POLITICAL ALLIANCES WITH EUROPEAN towards England? I do not so see it. Powers. In his memorable Farewell Address, President Again: the moment it was discovery Washington says: 'The great rule of conduct for us in regard o foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations o have with them as little political connexion as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.' President Jefferson, in his inaugural address, in 1801, warned the country against entaugling alliances. This expression, now become proverbial, was unquestionably used by Mr. Jefferson in reference to the alliance with France of 1778, an alliance at the time of incalculable benefit to the United States, but which in less than twenty years came near involving us in the wars of the French revolution, and laid the foundation of heavy claims upon Congress not extinguished to the present day. It is a significant goincidence that the particular provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the property of the standard provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the property of the standard provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the property of the standard provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned these evils was that the provision of the alliance which occasioned the provision of the alliance which under which France called upon us to aid her in defending her West Indian possessions against England. Nothing less than the unbounded influence of Washington rescued the Union from the perils of that crisis and preserved our neu-

As the Senator from Delaware is fond of the authority the late Secretary of State, and that of the late President is in violation of the solemn warnings of the Father of his Country, and in derogation of the protests of Mr. Jefferpassage, summed up the objections which I entertained to the Clayton and Bulwer treaty, and I will call the attention of the Senate to it. It is this:

" But the President has a graver objection to entering into the oposed convention. HE HAS NO WISH TO DISGUISE THE PEEL-NG THAT THE COMPACT, ALTHOUGH EQUAL IN ITS TERMS, WOULD BE VERY UNEQUAL IN SUBSTANCE. France and England, by entering into it, would disable themselves from obtaining possession of an island remote from their seats of Government, a another hemisphere, and one which by no ordinary or peace-

If the proposed guaranty never to annex Cuba was not how is it that it can be said that a similar guaranty re- out of rival interests, and that her policy has for its aim specting Central America was reciprocal? Every argument urged by the late Secretary of State against reciprocity in one applies with equal force to the other. It may be said that Cuba stands at the entrance of the Gulf of Mexico; but it can be said with equal truth that Central America is upon the public highway to our Pacific possessions. Both stand as gates to this public highway, applicable to the other.

" That a convention such as is proposed would be a TRANSITO-BY ARRANGEMENT, SURE TO BE SWEPT AWAY BY THE IRRESISTI BLE TIDE OF ARFAIRS, IN A NEW COUNTRY, IS, TO THE APPRE-BENSION OF THE PRESIDENT, TOO OBVIOUS TO REQUIRE A LA-BORED ARGUMENT. The project resis on principles APPLICABLE, if at all, TO EUROPE, where international relations are in their basis of great antiquity, slowly modified for the most part in the propers of time and ecents; and NOT APPLICABLE TO AMERICA. Where is the from Central adjusting, on natural principles, those territorial relations cy would be to hold the control of our own action, give

acting as the Secretary of State, gave a construction to that treaty which excludes the Belize. The Senator, the Fordunks of Cuba, Now and for Herman and the Fordunks of Cuba, Now and for Herman and the Fordunks of Cuba, Now and for Herman and the Fordunks of Cuba, Now and for Herman and the Fordunks of Cuba, Now and for Herman and the Fordunks of Cuba, Now and for Herman and the formation and the Fordunks of Cuba, Now and for Herman and the formation and th

is antiquated, decrepit, tottering on the verge of dissolu When you visit her the objects which enlist your highest admiration are the relies of past greatness—the broken columns erected to departed power. It is one vast graveyard, where you find here a tomb indicating the burial of the arts; there a monument marking the spot where liberty expired; another to the memory of a great man, whose place has never been filled. The cheicest products of her classic soil consist in relics, which remain as sad memorials of departed glory and fallen greatness. They bring up the memories of the dead, but inspire no hope for the living. Here every thing is fresh, blooming, expanding, and advancing. We wish a wise, practical policy adapted to our condition and position. Sir, the European models has failed to perceive the antagonism which exists in the relative position, history, institutions—in every thing pertaining to the Old and the New World.

The Senator from Delaware seems always to have had his back turned upon his own country, and his eye intently fixed upon Europe as the polar star of all his observations. tween the Senator from Delaware and his friend from Massachusetts, (Mr. Everett,) I should be inclined to say that the criticism of the late Secretary of State, although not intended for the Senator from Delaware, is strictly applicable to his diplomacy, and fully deserved. I shall not go into the discussion of that question, however. I deny the right of the Senator from Delaware to come back at me on that point. I shall certainly turn come back at me on that point. I shall certainly turn him over to his friend from Massachusetts, (Mr. EVERETT,) not aware that a State paper was ever issued in America that received a heartier response in most of its principles than the letter of the late Secretary of State to the Compte de Sartiges, to which I have referred. Sir, if he had done nothing else to render his administration of the State Department illustrious, his name would live in all coming time in that diplomatic letter, as one who could apprec treaty, it was his duty to send the treaty here that the ate the spirit of the age, and perceive the destiny of the nation. No document has ever received such a univer-

Mr. President, I have not much more to add. Th The Senator from Delaware will see that the late Sectoral set of Senator has arraigned me also for having attempted to retary of State, Mr. Everett, by the direction of President arouse unkind feelings between the United States and Fillmore, has pronounced such a guarantee to be a vio- England. I deny that the arraignment is just. I have lation of the constitution of the United States, and the attempted no such thing. I have never attempted to fos-exercise of an authority not conferred by that instrument. Sir, if the constitution gave no authority to make a pledge by this Government that we will never annex Cuba, I suppose it does not authorize a pledge never to annex Central America. The constitutional objection applies to the Clayton and Bulwer treaty, in relation to Central America. the ratification of the Chyton and Bulwer treaty, in relation to Cencerded their names in opposition to mine, he ought to have been content, without charging that I was naking it a tral America, with the same force that it did to the to be so "friendly" to us. I said to him I did not think party question. It was not a very agreeable thing to me proposed convention in respect to Cuba. They take the friendly relations of England constituted any claim proposed convention in respect to Cuba. which would involve a breach of faith in the progress of friendship. I said frankly I did not think that England events. But I did not go so far as to deny the constitu- loved us, and it was useless for us to pretend that we loved tional power to make such a treaty. And therefore I her. The history of the two countries proves it. The ask the Senator why he did not arraign President Fill-daily action of the two countries proves it. England more-why did he not a raign the late Secretary of State, is spending her millions to maintain her fortifications Mr. Everett, for uttering those monstrous sentiments, all along our coast; at the Bermudas, the Bahamas, and instead of hurling his anathemas upon my head, as if I at Jamaica, and on every rock and barren waste along the had been the only man in America who ever ventured to American coast. What does she keep them up for? Does proclaim such opinions? According to the opinions of she make money out of them? Why, you all know that

> enter into this treaty stipulation. They deny its pro- why do we not reciprocate it by sending over a few cannon priety, its justice, its wisdom, as well as the right to make and planting them on every little island and rock near her coast? If we were to seize upon every rock and expend millions in keeping up fortifications all along her coast, AMONG THE OLDEST TRADITIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT Would that be any evidence of friendly feeling on our part

Again: the moment it was discovered that we were to acquire California as a consequence of the Mexican war, England sent her armed ships and seized possession of the town of San Juan; and I have the authority of the Senator from Delaware for saying there is reason to believe that the act was done out of hostility to the American Government. Why did she want the town of San Juan establish a toll-gate upon our public highway, she seized possession of that point as the one-from which she could annov us most.

The Senator will not pretend that he believes that act originated in friendly feeling towards us on the part of England. I have his authority in his public documents of great names, I not only furnish him with the name of for saying that he believes it originated in motives of jealousy and hostility. The object was, not to advance he of the United States, upon the points to which I have re- own interest, not to increase her own commerce, not to ferred, but I have the authority of these gentlemen for extend her own power, but to restrain, fetter, and cripple saying that his doctrine with regard to Central America our energies and our power. Are these acts evidence of is in violation of the solemn warnings of the Father of his friendship on her part towards us, and are we so constituted that we feel grateful for them? Sir, let us not play son, repeated over and over again during his eventful life. the hypocrite upon this subject. Let us speak out the I find that the late Secretary of State has again, in another naked truth, plainly and boldly. We feel that this seizure of every rock and island upon our coast, and con verting them into garrisoned fortresses, with guns to bear on American commerce and American interests, are no evidence of friendship. We feel that these attempts to surround and fetter us, and hem us in, are evidences of hostility, which it is our duty plainly to see and boldly to resist. Sir, the way to establish friendly relations with England is to let her know that we are not so stupid as not to understand her policy, nor so pusillanimous as to submit to her aggressions. The moment she understands belonging to another European Power, whose natural right to possess it must always be as good as their own; a distant island that we mean what we say, and will carry out any principle we profess, she will be very careful not to create any In another hemisphere, and one which by no ordinary or peaceful course of things could ever belong to either of them. If the present balance of power in Europe should be broken up; if Spain should become unable to maintain the island in her possession, and France and England should be engaged in a death-struggle with each other. Cuba might then be the prize of the victor. Till these events all take place, the President does not see how Cuba can belong to any European Power but.

Spain. The Unity States, or the course was now and kindly towards her; and so long as she persists it. Spain. THE UNITED STATES, ON THE OTHER HAND, WOLLD, BY THE PROPOSED CONVENTION, DISABLE THEMSELVES FROM MAKING AN ACQUISITION WHICH MIGHT TAKE PLACE WITHOUT ANY DISCHARM OF PARTY PROPERTY BEAUTIONS, AND IN THE ACCURATION OF PARTY PROPERTY BEAUTIONS, AND IN THE ACCURATION. TURBANCE OF EXISTING POREIGN RELATIONS, AND IN THE PATU-her hostility; and of all things let us know whether she is our friend or our enemy. Therefore, I will repeat very frankly that it is useless to endeavor to conceal the fac reciprocal as between the United States and England, that there are jealousies between us and England growing It without attempting to restrain hers. Ours is generous, all honorable, and justifiable; hers is illiberal, unkind, un-

upon this question. My object has been simply to reply and every argument urged in relation to the one is equally to the points raised by the Senator in his speech. I do oblicable to the other.

Now, I have to quote the late Secretary of State and other points in the discussion into which I could have gone. President Fillmore against the Senator from Delaware on There are many other positions that the documents which another point. When I remarked that the history of this have been lately published would furnish me ample mate country showed that our growth and expansion could not rial for prolonging the discussion, but I do not wish to be resisted, and would inevitably break through whatever occupy the time of the Senate. I only wish to show that barriers might be erected by the present generation to the real points at issue are: first, that the Senator pre-restrain our future progress, the Senator from Delaware ferred a partnership with England to an exclusive priviassumed the right to rebuke me for uttering sentiments lege to his own country for the great inter-oceanic canal; implying perfidy and moral turpitude. He desired to secondly, that he believes in the policy of pledging this implying perfidy and moral turpitude. He desired to know if sentiments of that kind were to be tolerated in the American Senate? Let him hear his friend from Massachusetts on that point in the same document:

| Tepudiate that point in the course of the discussion of the last point, in the course of the discussion of the last point, in the course of the discussion of the last point, in the course of the discussion of the last point, in the course of the discussion of the last point, in the course of the discussion of the last point in the course of the last point in the course of the discussion of the last point in the course of the last point in the la sion, seems to have become the material one. He is op-posed to all further annexation, and wishes to make treaties now to restrain us in all time to come from extend-

I do not wish to annex any more territory now. But I

America? Are they not still in the full enjoyment of their protectorate upon the Mosquito coast? Have you driven them from the Belize?

The Senator from Michigan, (Mr. Cass.) and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, (Mr. Mason.) in their speeches, have maintained that the Clayton and Bulwer treaty would fairly include the Belize as a part of Gentral America. But the Senator from Delaware, while acting as the Secretary of State, gave a construction to Gull stream, as to attempt, by a command like this law of the continent were in a good depreted in the subject, but bide our time, and be at liberty to do whatever our interest, our honor, and duty require when the time for action may come. An old, decrept in their speeches, have maintained that the Clayton and Bulwer treaty would fairly include the Belize as a part of Gentral America. But the Senator from Delaware, while acting as the Secretary of State, gave a construction to her future growth. She desires to be left free to exercise her own powers, exert her own energies, according to her own sense of duty, in all coming time. This, sir, is the main issue between us, and I am ready to submit it to the Senate and to the country.

> SPEECH OF MR. BUTLER. OF SOUTH CAROLINA, On the Central American Treaty concluded with Great Britain on the 19th April, 1850.

IN THE SENATE, MARCH 16, 1853. Mr. BUTLER said: Mr. President, if this were a mere Mr. BUTLER said: Mr. President, if this were a mere gladiatorial contest between the Senators from Illinois and Delaware, I might forbear entering into the discussion; but topies have been discussed, doctrines avowed, and sentiments expressed from which I wholly dissent. I do not propose now to go into the questions which have been raised in the discussion of this subject itself. I thought it unfortunate when the subject was first introduced by the Senator from Michigan. It has given rise, in my deliberate judgment, to an unpropitious discussion in my deliberate judgment, to an unpropitious discussion of matters connected with our foreign relations. Sir, when delicate questions of diplomacy and of our relations with other Governments shall become the subject of open discussion in this Senate—nay, more, sir, the subject of open dis-cussion in this Senate—nay, more, sir, the subject of po-litical agitation and of party issues—we cannot hope to be favorably regarded by that kind of judgment which histo-ry dictates, and which is far superior, in my opinion, to the ephemeral opinions of the day. I heard the Senator from Illinois with great interests. from Illinois with great interest, and perhaps the ability with which he has spoken has, in some measure, reconciled us to the discussion itself, whilst it has not vindicated its original introduction; but I heard him avow an opinion from which I wholly dissent; and it was, as I understood him—and I wish the Senator to understand me, for I intend to make my proposition intelligible, and to exempt it from the questions mainly at issue between himself and the Senator from Delaware—I understood him to maintain this proposition: That the Hise treaty, repugnant essentially in nearly all of its provisions to the Constitution of the United States, and at variance with the general usage of the Government, should have been sent by the President to the Senate for its consideration, and there to be moulded and amended in a form so as to serve one single view entertained by the gentleman from Illimois. The treaty was not only entered into by one without authority, but its entire predicate is in ignorance and disregard of the constitutional powers of this Government. Mr. Douglas. I will restate my position. I stated expressly the other day, and intended to express the same idea now, that when the Hise treaty came to the State Department, it having been executed without authority, the Department was entirely at liberty either to withhold it or reject it unconditionally, or send it to the Senate as it saw proper. The rule as I understand it, is, that when a treaty is made in pursuance of instruction, the Department is under obligation, implied to the foreign Power, to send it here. When one is made without instruction, it may or may not send it as it sees proper; and I said, if the Senator from Delaware had been in favor of the exclusive privilege, and only objected to the details of the Hise

bjects desired might be secured? Mr. BUTLER. In that I differ entirely from the Senator from Illinois, as a cardinal principle affecting the func-tionary agency of this Government. The President of the United States is exclusively vested with the power of making treaties and having them perfected by the con-currence of two-thirds of the Senate; and, sir, it is the duty of the President to send a treaty down, an entire treaty, without expecting the Senate to perfect it for him. Will the Senator allow me to make my Mr. Douglas.

meaning intelligible to him? Mr. BUTLER. Not now; because I am going on to say, further, that the President of the United States, in my deliberate judgment, ought not to have sent the Hise treaty to the Senate, for it contained provisions that could receive the sanction of not only no Senator upon this floor, but of no jurist that can read and understand the Constitution of the United States. He dared not, according to my judgment, have sent it here. I suppose the Senator from Illinois will admit that there were provisions wholly repugnant to the Constitution in that treaty, and they were the essential and leading provisions constituting the staple of the treaty; they were not mere omissions or incidental objections. I am not going to enter into the contest which is carried on between the Senators from Illinois and Delaware. It is as a Senator of the United States that I wish to express my opinion upon the single proposition referred to, and one I consider of cardinal interest and importance, and one that may affect deeply the practical and constitutional workings of this Government—confounding the functions of one department of the Government with those which properly belong to another; in other words, making the Senate, which is but the advisory part of the treaty-making power, assume primary jurisdiction and responsibility. broad ground that the President ought to perfect the treaty in its essential provisions, and such as would receive the sanction of his judgment, before he sends it at all to the Senate for its consideration and concurrence; and when it contains provisions repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, he should not send it. I know that the honorable Senator, if he should ever occupy that place, would not do it; yet I understood him to say that the Hise treaty should have been sent here; that we should have taken, amended, and moulded it in such a way as to subserve the great objects contemplated. That could not be, according to the organization of this Government. The President has no right to send any but a treaty that he approves. I maintain the broad proposition that the President of the United States should send the treaty down as an entirety, and ask the Senate to ratify it or not, and amend it in such a way as to make it conform to the essential provisions which had received the approbation of the President. But to send a treaty down here, and ask the Senate to mould it in such a way as to make it proper, would be changing the whole func-tion of this Government, and would be a dangerous innovation. It would be something like the very innovation which has taken place by this debate—the making of this body the initiatory organ in relation to matters of diplo-macy. Now, what would be thought of such a procedure as this: Suppose the President were to send to the Senate a treaty with many provisions not having his approbation, with a recommendation that the Senate would take single provision of minor importance and graft upon it all other provisions that would make it an acceptable treaty? This would he, in my opinion, inverting the organic action of the Government. It would be devolving upon the Senate the function of making a treaty, and asking the President to concur in it. Whereas, by the Constitution of the United States, "he shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.' From this it is clear that it was contemplated that the Senate should be a reviewing and concurring body in and of a treaty already made by the President.

I rose merely to make this remark; but, sir, I am pledged in some measure to my constituents to discuss this subject fully. I am not prepared to do it now, be-cause I do not think I ought to interfere in such a debate as has been going on. Whilst I shall forbear at present from entering into the general topics of the debate allow myself to make one or two remarks, and I shall make them in perfect kindness to the Senator from Illinois. I do not undertake to say that the expansibility of our system is to be restrained by treaties. I do not mean to say that our progress is to be retarded in that way. Why, sir, the progress of human events is beyond the absolute control of any written law. It was unwise when Lycurgus made a code of laws which was never to be changed, and left his country with an injunction that it never should be changed. Laws are stationary, things are progressive. I concede that much to the honorable Senator from Illinois. But when I am told that the United States, as a civilized confederacy of Republics, are not to resort to the ordinary appliances of civilization to conduct their concerns and intercourse with the world by treaties, and that they are not to observe their obligations, or that they will not be restrained by them, but that the aggressive spirit of progress has no other higher law than the temptation of interest and policy, I do feel that if that prevails, we may grow fast, but we cannot live long. Nations, as well as individuals, must submit to the penalties of transgression; and, if the historian who is to write the history of this day, or of the events which are now transpiring with such eventful interest, were to pass his judgment, a part of that judgment would be, that whenever the United States in the spirit of progress, the spirit of aggressive progress, shall maintain or lustrated the doctrine that "might makes right," and that treaties can be violated with impunity, it was one of the elements of their decay. It seems to me that the doctrine of the honorable Senator from Illinois would make us a people to illustrate the destiny of Benjamin: "He shall raven as a wolf: in the morning he shall devour the prey, and at night he shall divide the spoil.

Sir, are we to fulfil that destiny, without law, without constraint? In my deliberate judgment, treaties and constitutions and laws are the restraining influences to prevent us from running with an acceleration that is likely to result in ruin. I love the restraints of treaties. I love all the restraints and controlling influences of civilization. I do not wish American society and the American Government to be like the Numidian cavalry, riding with spurs, and without bridles, to rush impetuously into the charge, perhaps to be successful for a moment, but to